

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 11-16 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 3 as being unclear. This objection is rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim.

Understanding of Art Rejections

Applicant notes several discrepancies in the form of the rejections which have been applied. Thus in paragraph 3, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 9 and 17 as being anticipated by Ellis (US 4,716,498). However, it is noted that claim 17 depends from claim 11 which has not been included in this rejection. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 17 was mistakenly included.

In the rejections in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, it is noted that the rejection has been made as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of a secondary reference. It is noted that dependent claims 12-16 and 18, which depend from claim 11 have been included in these rejections. However, the rejection of claim 11 included the Yumibe et al. (US 5,466,161) reference. It is believed that the Examiner meant to include this reference in the rejections in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8. This is especially indicated in the rejection in paragraph 6 which refers to the rejection of claim 3. The Examiner is requested to clarify the exact statement of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Ellis (US 4,716,498). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since these claims have all been cancelled, this rejection is rendered moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ellis in view of Yumibe et al. (US 5,466,161). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is noted that claim 3 has been cancelled rendering this part of the rejection moot. Concerning claim 11, the Examiner states that Ellis shows a shell device with a circuit unit where upper and lower circuit units are mounted on the inner surfaces. The Examiner relies on Yumibe et al. to show a compliant electrical connection component.

Applicant submits that claim 11 is not obvious over this combination of references. Claims 11 has now been amended to make it clear that the two circuit units are printed directly on the inner surfaces of the shells and that the electrical connection component directly connects the two circuit units electrically. In the Ellis reference, the circuit units are not printed directly on the surfaces of the shells, but instead are separate parts which are mounted on the shells. Further, it is noted that the Ellis reference refers to elements 49a and 49b as substrates and hence are not circuit units.

With regard to Yumibe et al., the connector 10 does not directly connect boards 30 and 34, but instead contacts the contact pads 32 and 37. Accordingly, this reference does not show the direct electrical connection as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make these claims additionally allowable.

Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ellis in view of Aronson et al. (US Published Application 2004/0198079). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Concerning claim 4, this claim has been cancelled rendering this part of the rejection moot. Concerning claim 12, even if Aronson et al. does show a conductive foam member, this claim still remains allowable based on its dependency from allowable claim 11.

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ellis in view of Saitoh et al. (US 6,175,084). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Concerning claims 5-8, this rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

Concerning claims 13-16, Applicant submits that the addition of the Saitoh et al. teachings do not render these claims obvious. In particular, even if Saitoh et al. does teach the layers as pointed out by the Examiner, these layers still are not printed directly on the inner surfaces of the shell so that this claim remains allowable based on its dependency from allowable claim 11.

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Ellis in view of Brown et al. (US 4,823,233). This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

The Examiner states that Brown et al. teaches an electronic shell having a circuit unit being printed on the upper and lower inner surfaces of the shell. However, it is not at all clear what the Examiner is referring to. Figure 1 shows the integrated circuits being mounted on plate member 14 with conductor 17 extending to conductor areas 18 adjacent the outside edges of the plate members. These area make contact with conductor strip 19 which run along the side of the walls. Applicant submits that this reference does not show circuit units being printed on the inner surfaces of an upper and lower shell. Applicant submits that even if the teachings of Brown et al. were added to the combination of Ellis and Yumibe et al., that claim 11 would still remain allowable. Accordingly, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable over any combination of these references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/673,397
Amendment dated September 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2005

Docket No.: 2019-0222P
Art Unit 2841
Page 7 of 7 pages

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Robert F. Gnuse, Registration No. 27,295, at (703) 205-8076, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant